

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **12 August 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because it is not tangibly embodied. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because it is not tangibly embodied. Claims 11-16 and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 due to their dependency on claims 9 and 17 respectively. Claims 1 and 3-8 were allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 9 and 11-16 were rejected as not being tangibly embodied.

Applicant has amended paragraph [0020] of the specification to remove the intangible embodiments of the storage medium.

Claims 17 and 19-24 were rejected as not being tangibly embodied.

Applicant has canceled claims 17 and 19-24 without prejudice.


Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9 to reduce prolixity.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-8, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 11-16, which depend upon claim 9, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 16 September 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665